



THE MONTEAGUE Independent

Rainsville lawyer stands by her affidavit

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

By Bob Martin, Editor & Publisher

EDITOR'S NOTE: On June 7th., The Independent was the first to publish Rainsville attorney Jill Simpson's full affidavit, alleging politics were involved in the prosecution of Don Siegelman and Richard Scrushy. Her veracity has been questioned by several media sources and those about whom she spoke. On Tuesday after business hours and nearing our deadline, Ms. Simpson e-mailed The Independent the following statement. The editor does not know Ms. Simpson personally, nor do we know whether or not her statements are truthful, even though they were made under oath. Her statements have received worldwide attention, even prompting The New York Times to call for a Congressional probe. However, this is such a significant matter that we believe her further comments deserve attention. Her e-mail arrived too late for us to solicit responses from the names mentioned. However, should anyone named desire to issue a statement for next week's issue, please call Bill Rice, Jr. managing editor. Ms. Simpson's statement follows:

I am issuing this statement concerning my role in reporting matters in which I consider to be very serious.

On the 21st day of May 2007, I signed a sworn affidavit that among other things pertained to the criminal investigation and prosecution of former Governor Don Siegelman. There has been a great deal of media interest in this affidavit. My statement in the affidavit was given under oath as to the truth and correctness contained therein. (Ms. Simpson's affidavit was first published in The Independent on June 7th.) On Sunday, July 8, 2007, an article ran in The Birmingham News, which gives me great concern. I think the reporter, (Bret Blackledge) may have misunderstood what I was attempting to convey and it appeared he only wanted to debate paragraph 16 of my affidavit.

He suggested when we were talking that Mr. Canary might have a different interpretation of what was said on the telephone on November 18, 2002. In paragraph 16 of my affidavit I stated: "Rob Riley then asked if he was sure these "girls" could take care of Don Siegelman and William "Bill" Canary told him not to worry that he had already gotten it worked out with Karl and Karl had spoken with the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice was already pursuing Don Siegelman," I assumed that it had to be Karl Rove. It is my understanding Bill Canary is very close to Karl Rove and I believe that he worked with Mr. Rove when he was living in Washington and that they have worked on numerous campaigns in Alabama. I further assumed during this conversation that when Mr. Canary said "Karl had spoken with the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice was already pursuing Don Siegelman" that he meant that Karl Rove had already talked with the Department of Justice and that the Department of Justice was pursuing Mr. Siegelman. Mr. Blackledge suggested to me that Mr. Canary might have meant that the Justice Department was already pursuing Mr. Siegelman and that Karl was just repeating what he knew. Regardless of either interpretation, one has to wonder why Mr. Siegelman's case was being discussed by Karl Rove with the Department of Justice and why Mr. Rove was discussing this with Mr. Canary.

Rob Riley has made statements to the media that he has had little to do with me since college. This is very surprising, he knows that we have worked together in many plaintiff cases and a matter pertaining to a government contract over the past few years. I have boxes of records and checks that will prove this close association. He knows that I am a long time Republican and worked actively in his father's campaigns.

A former lawyer came to see me and said he was sent by Governor Bob Riley and Gerald Dial. This man asked me to do things that I worried were illegal and certainly unethical in the Senate election contest against Democratic Senator Lowell Barron, Senator Zeb Little, Senator Roger Bedford and Senator Hank Sanders. I did not want to get mixed up in these things and told him I was not interested in any involvement.

Beginning in the fall of 2006 and later in January and February of this year, I thought that I had better protect myself so I reported some of these matters to the Alabama Bar Association and also sought the assistance of a well respected Montgomery attorney, Joe Espy. I had several conversations with Robbie Lusk at the Alabama Bar about these concerns. He confirmed that, if accurate, these were very serious matters. These matters were reported, as described above, several months before I prepared and executed my affidavit.

After executing the affidavit the Governor's former Chief of Staff and now Choctaw Indian lobbyist, Toby Roth, issued a statement that labeled me a disgruntled state government contract bidder. This is a false statement as I have never been a state government contract bidder and I am not disgruntled. I am a lawyer who represents bidders.

I did this affidavit as I have previously stated because I felt that both Mr. Scrushy and Mr. Siegelman had a sixth amendment right to a fair trial and I did not believe that either of these two men received a fair trial.

Further I believe Mr. Siegelman and Mr. Scrushy were politically persecuted and believe I did the right thing in telling what I knew.

I stand 100 percent behind my sworn statements contained in my affidavit. I welcome the opportunity to testify under oath to any investigative agency and/or court of law. I would assume that Gov. Bob Riley, Rob Riley, Terry Butts, Bill Canary, his wife U.S. Attorney Leura Canary, U.S. Attorney Alice H. Martin, U.S. Acting Attorney, Louis Franklin, U.S. Attorney Stephen P. Feaga, Toby Roth, and Karl Rove would be willing to do the same so this whole controversy can be resolved.

© 2007 The Montgomery Independent

© 2007 al.com All Rights Reserved.